

REMARKS

In the March 17, 2005 Office Action, claims 10-18 stand rejected in view of prior art. Claim 17 is also rejected for failing to indicate and claim particularly and distinctly the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. No other objections or rejections are made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the March 17, 2005 Office Action, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 10 and 14-18 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-25 are pending, with claims 1-9 and 19-25 being withdrawn from consideration, and claims 1, 10, and 19 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

Election of Species

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, Applicants' election with traverse is acknowledged. Thus, non-elected claims 1-9 and 19-25 are withdrawn from further consideration. Applicants hereby affirm election of claims 10-18. However, Applicants respectfully request that non-elected claims 1-9 and 19-25 be rejoined in this application upon allowance of a generic or linking claim.

Drawings

Applicants have found a typographical error in Figure 10. More specifically, the reference number for the first reel control unit is incorrectly typed as "30", when it should be -- 31 -- as set forth on page 22, line 27 -- page 23, line 16 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants believe that the drawings are now correct and comply with 37 CFR §1.83(a).

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to provide further antecedent basis for the limitations of claims 10 and 17 as now amended. Applicants believe that the specification is now correct and complies with 37 CFR §1.71 and §1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicants have amended claim 17 to clarify its language.

Specifically, claim 17 has been amended to recite the operation key unit, through which the first and second information can be modified. The language of claim 17 as now amended is supported by page 7, lines 18-20 and page 15, lines 14-18 of the specification as originally filed. Therefore, Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the current amendment to claim 17.

Applicants believe that claim 17 now complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2002/027878 to Furomoto ("Furomoto patent"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 10 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claim 10 has been amended to recite that the fishing information display device information communication unit *wirelessly communicates* with the information communication unit of the fishing reel and the information communication unit of the external information device to receive the first and second information. In other words, the fishing information display device of the present invention *wirelessly, not internally*, acquires the first and second information via the information communication units. Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Furomoto patent or any other prior art of record.

The Office Action asserts that the display portion 5 corresponds to the fishing information display device of the present invention, that the spool sensor 41, the spool counter 42, the memory 43, the PWM drive circuit 31, and the connector 60 discussed in paragraph 0017 correspond to the first acquiring means, and that the display of water depth information discussed in paragraph 0021 corresponds to the second acquiring means. However, Applicants believe that the arrangement of the Furomoto patent does not satisfy the requirements of claim 10 as now amended.

More specifically, Applicants believe that the Furomoto patent does not disclose or suggest the fishing information display device information communication unit that *wirelessly* communicates with the information communication unit of other devices to acquire the first and second information. As clearly described in paragraphs 0016-0018 of

the Furomoto patent, the display portion 5 is a part of the water depth display device 4. The display portion 5 is **physically** connected to the reel control circuit 30, as are the spool sensor 41, the spool counter 42, the memory 43, and the PWM drive circuit 31, **not wirelessly through information communication unit**. This is clearly contrary to the requirement of claim 10.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claim 16 is also allowable over the prior art of record since it depends from independent claim 10, and therefore is narrower. Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate independent claim 10, neither does the prior art anticipate dependent claim 16.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 5-6 of the Office Action, claims 11-13, 15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Furomoto patent in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0053617 to Nanbu ("Nanbu patent"). Claims 14 stands rejected as being unpatentable over the Furomoto patent in view of the Nanbu patent and Japanest Patent Application Publication No. 2002-247940 to Kuriyama ("Kuriyama patent"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 10 as mentioned above.

More specifically, independent claim 10 now clearly recites that the fishing information display device information communication unit **wirelessly** communicates with the information communication unit of the fishing reel and the information communication unit of the external information device to receive the first and second information. Clearly, this arrangement is **not** disclosed or suggested by the Furomoto patent, the Nanbu patent, the Kuriyama patent or any other prior art of record.

Discussion of the Furomoto patent has been advanced above. Applicants believe that the Furomoto patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 10.

The Nanbu patent has been cited to show the fish finder data transmitted from the fish finder. However, as clearly seen in Figure 1, the display 27 of the Nanbu patent is an integral

part of the fishing reel. Although the fishing finder data may be transmitted to the display 27 via the receiver 61, the Nanbu patent does not disclose or suggest the fishing information display device information communication unit that *wirelessly communicates with the information communication unit of the fishing reel to receive the first data*. Therefore, Applicants believe that the Nanbu patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 10, whether taken singularly or in combination with the Furomoto patent.

The Kuriyama patent has been cited in the Office Action to show the switching of the display between a detail mode and a simple mode. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the information communication unit of the fishing information display device that wirelessly communicates with the information communication unit of an external device to obtain the first or the second information. Therefore, Applicants believe that the Kuriyama patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 10, whether taken singularly or in combination with the Furomoto patent and the Nanbu patent.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 11-13, 15, 17, and 18 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 10, and therefore are narrower. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 10, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in dependent claims 11-13, 15, 17, and 18.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references are made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants have submitted Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2002-262739 as Information Disclosure Statement on March 1, 2005. Applicants respectfully request that this reference be indicated as a reference cited.


Applicants also attach herewith Information Disclosure Statement, together with a petition for acceptance thereof. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

Appl. No. 10/674,067
Amendment dated July 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10-18 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Kiyoe K. Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: July 14, 2005

G:\06-JUN05-MT\SN-US020279 Amendment.doc

Appl. No. 10/674,067
Amendment dated July 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Figure 10. This sheet of Figure 10 replaces the original sheet of Figure 10.

Attachment: one (1) replacement sheet